



EXPRESS MAIL EV 243649990 US

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Estakhri et al. Attorney Docket #: 38979-11C2
Serial No.: 09/620,544
Filing Date: 07/21/2000 Examiner: Bragdon, R.
Group Art No.: 2186 Batch No.: Unknown
Title: "MOVING SECTORS WITHIN A BLOCK OF INFORMATION IN A FLASH
MEMORY MASS STORAGE ARCHITECTURE"

Attention: Office of Petitions
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Box DAC
Washington, D. C. 20231

RECEIVED

APR 15 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

STATEMENT FOR RENEWED PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT
ABANDONED UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137 (b)

Dear Sir:

The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137 (b) was unintentional. An amendment/response to a final office action was filed on December 3, 2001. However, sometime in early 2002, in the January/February time frame, the attorney of record, Maryam Imam, was informed, via a telephone call from the Examiner of record, Reginald Bragdon, that the December 3rd amendment was not going to be entered due to the amendments made to the claims in response to a final office action and that a Notice of Abandonment should be expected.

The Notice of Abandonment was awaited but not received. Thus, a call was made to the Examiner in the last week of April, 2002 to inquire into the situation. The Examiner kindly located the file and we determined that the Notice of Abandonment was sent to my previous office address because no change of address was noted in the USPTO records even though one was filed by the Applicant. Accordingly, the Examiner faxed a copy of the Notice of Abandonment to me on April 30, 2002.

A Petition to Revive including the previously-filed, yet un-entered, response/amendment to the final office was filed by the Applicant on May 7, 2002. However, the Applicants were not notified of any decision regarding the Petition to Revive for the remainder of the year and well into the following year. Accordingly, in March of 2003, the Applicants' attorney's office placed a call to the Examiner inquiring into the status of the case and was referred to the Petitions Department. Upon contacting the

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.10(a))

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" - Rule 10: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 as Express Mail No. EV 243649990 US addressed to the Office of Petitions, Box DAC, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on April 9, 2003 by Erika Villafana


Erika Villafana

April 9, 2003

Petitions Department in the last week of March of 2003, the Applicant was informed that a decision had in fact been rendered as to the Petition to Revive but it had been erroneously sent to the Applicant's previous address of two years ago, as the USPTO had again failed to acknowledge the two Change of Correspondence Addresses previously filed by the Applicants. The Applicants' attorney's office was told that the decision regarding the Petition to Revive along with an Advisory Action was sent, in October of 2002, to an old address, with a deadline of two months for a reply to be filed by way of a reconsideration request of the Petition to Revive, as the Petition had been dismissed.

The Petitions Department acknowledged its failure to effectuate the previous Change of Address filings and accordingly mailed a substitute decision, to the Applicants' attorney's current address, regarding the Petition to Revive, on April 1, 2003. The Applicants are now given two months from the April 1, 2003 to file a reply by way of a reconsideration request. The Applicants received the dismissal decision regarding the Petition on April 7, 2003 along with an advisory action, which was also erroneously sent to an old address. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the foregoing Renewed Petition to Revive.


As the amendment dated December 3, 2001 was not entered due to new issues having been raised requiring a search, an Request for Continued Examination is being made herewith and a request is being made to enter the amendment to the final office action and that the case be reconsidered accordingly. A copy of a previously-filed Change of Correspondence Address is being submitted herewith in an effort to avoid any further problems with respect to correspondences sent to the Applicant's attorney's old address. A corresponding petition fee associated with the Petition to Revive was paid on May 7, 2003. However, if there is any fee deficiency, the USPTO is being authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account of 501638.

We respectfully request that the Renewed Petition for Revival for this application be granted. Please direct a decision to the address below.

Dated: April 9, 2003

Respectfully submitted

Law Offices of Imam & Associates
111 North Market Street, Suite 1010
San Jose, CA 95113
Telephone (408) 271-8752/3
Facsimile (408) 271-8886

By 
Maryam Imam
Reg. No. 38,190